

IN THE DRAWINGS

FIG. 14 has been amended to comply with the Examiner's objection pursuant to 37 CFR 1.83(a).

Attachments:

Replacement Drawing Sheet (1 page) labeled FIG. 14.

Annotated Drawing Sheet (1 page) labeled FIG. 14.

REMARKS

The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated March 16, 2007. Claims 1, 2, 19, 20, 35 and 37 have been amended. Claim 51 has been added. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments and new claim. Claims 8-18, 25-34, 36 and 38 have been withdrawn from further consideration and claims 3-6, 21-24, 39-40, 42, 44, 47 and 50 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 7-20, 25-38, 41, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49 and 51 are pending.

Specification

The title has been amended to be more clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claims 39-48 have been renumbered to 41-50 in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126.

FIG. 14 has been amended to comply with the Examiner's objection pursuant to 37 CFR 1.83(a). In particular, FIG. 14 has been amended to show drive 140 as described in the specification (page 29, lines 2-4).

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of objections directed to the specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 42, 43, 46 and 49 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of objections directed to claims 42, 43, 46 and 49.

Claim Rejections 35 USC 112

Claims 1, 2, 7, 19, 20, 35 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite in part "memory control means for controlling writing said packets into said memory means, for controlling reading said packets from said memory means, for issuing a command to prepare transferring." In one embodiment of the present application, the memory control means includes FIFO controller 63 of the control machine 131. The FIFO controller controls writing and reading operations of SDRAM 60 through SDRAM controller 59 (see page 17, lines 4-7 of the present application). The control machine 131 comprises FIFO controller 63 and command arbiter 83 (see page 21, lines 21-23 of the present application). The command arbiter 83 discriminates whether the capacity of FIFO 61 has exceeded the limit value through FIFO control 63 and if exceeded the limit, an instruction to start DMA transfer is issued to control machine 132 for preparing DMA transfer (see page 22, lines 11-26 of the present application). Thus, it is believed that the rejection pertaining to written description has been addressed and thus it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn. Claims 19, 35 and 37 recite similar limitations as claim 1. Accordingly, claims 19, 35 and 37 are believed to satisfy the written description requirements for the same reasons as claim 1 explained above.

Claims 41 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 41 recites "said packets transferring control means supplies start address of said recording means." Claim 42 recites "said packets transferring control means updates said

start address of said recording means." The Examiner asserts that the Applicant has failed to provide support for such limitations.

Claim 41 has been amended to delete the limitation "said packets transferring control means supplies start address of said recording means." Claim 42 has been canceled. Thus, it is believed that the rejection of claims 41 and 42 has been addressed. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 41 and 42 be withdrawn.

Claims 43-44, 46-47 and 49-50 recite respective limitations similar to that of claims 41 and 42. Claims 43-44, 46-47 and 49-50 have been addressed in a manner similar to claims 41 and 42 as explained above. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 43-44, 46-47 and 49-50 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 7, 19-20, 35-37, 41-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements/steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements/steps. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention. First, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of an "arbiter" based on the description from page 16, line 26 to page 17, lines 1-11. Second, also added was the limitation "outputting said packets added said address to said recording means" to index adding means as described on page 8, lines 1-11 and page 17, lines 8-20 of the present application. Third, the limitation of packets also added was the limitation "supplying a start address" to memory control means as described on page 22, line 27 to page 23, line 5 of the present application. Fourth, in connection with the limitation of packets transferring control means (see page 17, lines 8-20), the phrase "so that. . . .control means" has been replaced with limitation of counting-up means based on the description from page 23, lines 14-18. Fifth, the

limitation "for recording to a recording means" from extracting means was deleted. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the above remarks and claim amendments clarify the claimed invention sufficient to overcome the rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 41, 42, 19-20, 43-44, 35, 45-47, 37 and 48-50 recite limitations that are ambiguous.

In particular, claim 1 recites "memory control means for controlling writing and reading said packets of said memory means." The Examiner asserts that such limitation is ambiguous. Claim 1 has been amended to separate the writing and reading functions as described on page 23, lines 14-26 of the present application.

In particular, claim 2 recites "said transferring of said packets is made cluster by cluster of a predetermined data amount." Claim 2 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Specifically, claim 2 has been amended to recite "said transferring of said packets is made cluster by cluster, said cluster being of a predetermined data amount." (emphasis added).

In particular, claim 42 recites "once determined said end status." The Examiner has rejected this limitation as being ambiguous. Claim 42 has been canceled. Thus, this rejection is moot.

Claims 19-20, 43-44, 35, 45-47, 37, 48-50 generally correspond to claims 1-2, 41-42 and were rejected on the same basis. Applicants have treated claims 19-20, 43-44, 35, 45-47, 37, 48-50 in a manner similar to claims 1-2 and 41-42.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 41-42, 19-20, 43-44, 35, 45-47, 37 and 48-50.

Claim Rejections 35 USC 103

Claims 1-2, 7, 19-20, 35, 37 and 41-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant

Admitted Prior Art (AAPA: pages 1-9 and FIG. 1) in view of Mergard (US 5,881,248).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite an information processing apparatus that includes an arbiter means and a count-up means. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite in part:

"An information processing apparatus comprising ...
arbiter for mediating said packets extracted by said extracting means storing said memory means, and for mediating said packets outputting from said memory means to said index adding means in response to an instruction from said memory control means; and
packets transferring control means for permitting write access of said packets outputted from said index adding means to said recording means in accordance with said command from said memory control means, wherein said packets transferring control means including address determining means for starting updating an address of said recording means when said start address is inputted from said memory control means by counting up said address of memory means each time transferring said packets of predetermined data amount." (emphasis added).

It is respectfully submitted that the portions of AAPA relied on by the Examiner in explaining the above 103 rejection of claim 1 do not appear to specifically disclose the above-identified features of claim 1 for the reasons below.

AAPA fails to disclose the above-identified limitations of claim 1. AAPA discloses a host I/F (DMA) 29 component which functions as an interface for communicating with CPU (i.e., control means) 1 through bus unit 3. The CPU executes a command to the hard disk, sets the LBA at each block transfer and sets the transfer start timing, etc. In other words, the CPU 1 controls the transfer of data. However, AAPA fails to disclose an arbiter and count-up means as recited in amended claim 1 of the present application. Mergard does not overcome the deficiencies of AAPA. Thus, AAPA alone or in

combination with Mergard disclose the claimed invention as recited in claim 1.

Claims 19, 35 and 37 have been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 19, 35 and 37 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2 and 7 depend from claim 1 and contain all of the limitations thereof. Likewise, claim 20 depends from claim 19 and contains all of the limitations thereof.

New claim

Claim 51 has been added. Claim 51 depends from claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Support for this claim can be found in the application. No new matter has been added.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 18, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Arthur S. Ortega
Registration No.: 53,422
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRAMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

748380_1.DOC

**ANNOTATED
SHEET**

Fig. 14

